

TABLE OF APPENDICES

	<i>Page</i>
APPENDIX A—OPINION OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY, APPELLATE DIVISION, FILED APRIL 27, 2022.....	1a
APPENDIX B — OPINION OF THE NEW JERSEY JUDICIARY SUPERIOR COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION, FILED MARCH 27, 2020	5a
APPENDIX C — ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY, FILED JULY 19, 2023.....	37a
APPENDIX D — ORDER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY, FILED MARCH 5, 2024	39a
APPENDIX E — LETTER FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, FILED JUNE 7, 2024	41a

APPENDIX A — OPINION OF THE SUPERIOR
COURT OF NEW JERSEY, APPELLATE DIVISION,
FILED APRIL 27, 2022

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION

DOCKET NO. A-3040-19

LENA LASHER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

PETER RICCIO, LAURA HISHMEH, AND
MICHAEL DELLA-VENTURA,

Defendants-Respondents,

and

STEVEN GOLOFF, DANIEL GEIGER, JAMES
BARNES, ALBERT BUCK, JOHN NICHOLAS
BURLING, AND ANU KONAKANCHI,

Defendants.

March 1, 2022, Submitted;
April 27, 2022, Decided

Before Judges Currier and DeAlmeida.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey,
Law Division, Middlesex County, Docket No. L-7984-18.

Appendix A

PER CURIAM

Plaintiff appeals from several February 10, 2020 trial court orders that: (1) denied reconsideration of an earlier order dismissing her complaint as to defendant Hishmeh; (2) denied her motion to reinstate her complaint against defendants Della-Ventura and Riccio; and (3) granted Della-Ventura's and Riccio's motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice. After reviewing the orders for an abuse of discretion, and finding none, we affirm.

Plaintiff, a licensed pharmacist, was charged in a federal indictment for selling misbranded prescription drugs, mail and wire fraud, and conspiracy. A jury found her guilty of the charges and she was sentenced to three years in federal prison. The convictions were affirmed.

When plaintiff was released from prison, she instituted suit against the defendants in a May 2016 complaint. Pertinent to this appeal are defendants **Laura Hishmeh, the bookkeeper for the pharmacy, and licensed pharmacists Michael Della-Ventura and Peter Riccio.** [Emphasis added.]

After plaintiff failed to provide discovery regarding her claims against Hishmeh, the 2016 complaint was initially dismissed without prejudice and then was dismissed with prejudice in June 2017.

Plaintiff filed a new complaint in 2018, amended in 2019 (the 2019 complaint), that alleged the same claims against Hishmeh arising out of the same facts as the

Appendix A

earlier complaint. The trial court dismissed the complaint with prejudice and denied reconsideration of its order. We discern no reason to disturb the trial court's orders.

As we stated in *Albarran v. Lukas*, 276 N.J. Super. 91, 95, 647 A.2d 476 (App. Div. 1994), "when the time and notice requirements of *Rule* 4:23-5 have been satisfied and an order dismissing the case with prejudice is entered, that dismissal constitutes an adjudication on the merits."

Plaintiff did not move for reconsideration of the June 2017 order dismissing the 2016 complaint with prejudice. She did not move to vacate the final order under *Rule* 4:50-1. Nor did she appeal the dismissal of the complaint. Plaintiff cannot renew her claims in a subsequent complaint.

As to the remaining defendants, although plaintiff sued Della-Ventura and Riccio in the 2016 complaint, they were never served with the complaint and the case against them was dismissed under *Rule* 1:13-7 for lack of prosecution in November 2016. After plaintiff filed her amended 2019 complaint, she moved to reinstate the 2016 complaint as to defendants Della-Ventura and Riccio. Those defendants opposed the reinstatement motion and cross-moved for a dismissal of the 2019 complaint with prejudice because it alleged the same claims arising out of the same facts as the 2016 complaint. The court denied the motion to reinstate the 2016 complaint and granted defendants' motion to dismiss the 2019 complaint with prejudice under the February 10, 2020 order.

Appendix A

The 2016 complaint was dismissed as to defendants Della-Ventura and Riccio under *Rule 1:13-7* for plaintiff's failure to prosecute her claims. In order to reinstate her complaint, plaintiff had to show good cause to vacate the dismissal. *R. 1:13-7* ("After dismissal, . . . plaintiff shall move on good cause shown for vacation of the dismissal."). Plaintiff's motion to reinstate the complaint was filed almost three years after the 2016 dismissal. And she did not demonstrate good cause for her failure to move for reinstatement sooner. We discern no error in the court's orders denying plaintiff's motion to reinstate the 2016 complaint and dismissing the 2019 complaint with prejudice as to defendants Della-Ventura and Riccio.

To the extent we have not specifically commented on any further arguments, all other points plaintiff raises on appeal lack sufficient merit to warrant discussion. *R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(E)*.

Affirmed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the original on file in my office.

/s/ [Illegible]

CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION

**APPENDIX B — OPINION OF THE NEW JERSEY
JUDICIARY SUPERIOR COURT,
APPELLATE DIVISION, FILED MARCH 27, 2020**

FORM B1

**New Jersey Judiciary
Superior Court – Appellate Division
Civil Case Information Statement**

A 3040-19

Filed March 27, 2020

Please type or clearly print all information.

Title in Full (1) Lena Lasher v. Peter Riccio, et al

Trial Court or Agency Docket Number (2) Middlesex
County Superior Court MID L007984-18

- Attach additional sheets as necessary for any information below.

(3) Appellant's Attorney

Email Address: lenalasher@yahoo.com

Plaintiff Defendant Other (Specify)

Name Lena Lasher

Street Address City State Zip Telephone Number
16 Patton St. High Bridge NJ 08829 908-447-4484

Appendix B

(4) Respondent's Attorney*

Name Howard D. Crane
Koerner & Crane LLC
Street Address City State Zip Telephone Number
308 Route 206
Hillsborough NJ 08844

Name Edward G. Sonzilli
Norris McLaughlin PA
Street Address City State Zip Telephone Number
400 Crossing Blvd 8th Floor, PO Box 5933
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

Name Joshua M. Link, Esq.
Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
Street Address City State Zip Telephone Number
1200 Liberty Ridge Drive
Suite 310
Wayne PA 19087

*Indicate which parties, if any, did not participate below
or were no longer parties to the action at the time of entry
of the judgment or decision being appealed.

**(5) Give Date and Summary of Judgment, Order, or
Decision BeingAppealed and Attach a Copy:**

(8) 2/10/20 and 2/14/20 Orders

**(6) Are there any claims against any party below, either in
this or a consolidated action, which have not been disposed**

Appendix B

of, including counterclaims, cross-claims, third-party claims and applications for counsel fees?

Yes No

If so, has the order been properly certified as final pursuant to *R. 4:42-2*? (If not, leave to appeal must be sought. *R. 2:2-4,2:5-6*)

Yes No

(If the order has been certified, attach, together with a copy of the order, a copy of the complaint or any other relevant pleadings and a brief explanation as to why the order qualified for certification pursuant to *R. 4:42-2*.)

Were any claims dismissed without prejudice?

Yes No

If so, explain and indicate any agreement between the parties concerning future disposition of those claims. A prior order for dismissal WITHOUT prejudice as to Defendants Konakanchi, Goloff, Geiger, Barnes, Buck, and Burling was ordered by Judge Brady on June 26, 2019 (See Exhibit A) pursuant to a June 3, 2019 Order ordering the Plaintiff to cease the civil action against the aforementioned Defendants (See Exhibit B) for a period of three years

Appendix B

(7) Is the validity of a statute, regulation, executive order, franchise or constitutional provision of this State being questioned? (*R. 25-1(g)*)

Yes No

(8) Give a Brief Statement of the Facts and Procedural History: Answers for questions #8 and 9

- The Plaintiff's civil action is within the statute of limitation due to newly discovered evidence which were not turned over to the Plaintiff until July 2018, the Plaintiff then filed the civil action in November 2018, thus this is within the two years statute of limitation N.J.S.A. 2A:14-2
- The Plaintiff's civil action was above identity theft and forgeries/perjuries committed against her by the Defendants. However trial judge and the Defendants kept on ignoring (continue with question #9)

(9) To the extent possible, list the proposed issues to be raised on the appeal as they will be described in appropriate point headings pursuant to *R. 2:6-2(a)(5)*. (Appellant or cross-appellant only.): (Continue from Question #8) her lawsuit and talked about her conviction at the February 7, 2020 hearing. In otherwords, the Defendants and trial judge mischaracterized the Plaintiff's complaint as if it was about her conviction. Every time the Plaintiff bring up the subject of identity theft, the Defendants changed the subject and mischaracterized their misconduct against the Plaintiff. It is important to note that Defendant Riccio

Appendix B

plead guilty to narcotics conspiracy, a felony conviction. The Plaintiff is a victim of Defendant Riccio's crime of identity theft. N.J.S.A. 52:4B-61. At the February 7, 2020 hearing, the Defendants misrepresented the Plaintiff's conviction and made up lies about her conviction.

- Plaintiff's affidavit of merit complies with N.J.S.A. 2A53A-27-Affidavit of merit was supposed to be ruled by Judge Jamie D. Happas. However trial judge unconstitutionally denied the Plaintiff's affidavit of merit without a hearing about it
- The trial Judge and Defendants were distracted by AUSA Richenthal who wasn't even at the hearing but weighed in the civil suit which he has absolutely nothing to do with and keep lying about what the Plaintiff was convicted of; the Defendants lied with authoritatively because they talked to Richenthal – there's the correlation.

(10) If you are appealing from a judgment entered by a trial judge sitting without a jury or from an order of the trial court, complete the following:

1. Did the trial judge issue oral findings or an opinion? If so, on what date? 2/7/20

Yes No

2. Did the trial judge issue written findings or an opinion? If so, on what date? 2/10/20 & 2/14/20

Yes No

Appendix B

3. Will the trial judge be filing a statement or an opinion pursuant to *R. 2:5-1(b)*? don't know

Yes No

Caution: Before you indicate that there was neither findings nor an opinion, you should inquire of the trial judge to determine whether findings or an opinion was placed on the record out of counsel's presence or whether the judge will be filing a statement or opinion pursuant to *R. 2:5-1(b)*.

Date of Your Inquiry: _____

1. Is there any appeal now pending or about to be brought before this court which:

(11) (A) Arises from substantially the same case or controversy as this appeal?

Yes No

(12) (B) Involves an issue that is substantially the same, similar or related to an issue in this appeal?

Yes No

(13) 2. Was there any prior appeal involving this case or controversy?

Yes No

Appendix B

(14) If the answer to either 1 or 2 above is Yes, state:

Case Name: Appellate Division Docket Number:

Civil appeals are screened for submission to the Civil Appeals Settlement Program (CASP) to determine their potential for settlement or, in the alternative, a simplification of the issues and any other matters that may aid in the disposition or handling of the appeal. Please consider these when responding to the following question. A negative response will not necessarily rule out the scheduling of a preargument conference.

(15) State whether you think this case may benefit from a CASP conference.

Yes No

Explain your answer:

At the February 7, 2020 hearing, the Defendants did NOT deny that they committed perjuries/fraud and/or identity theft against the Plaintiff. Also, Defendant Laura Hishmeh did not deny forging plaintiff's signatures nor denied receiving bonuses for forging plaintiff's signatures

(16) Whether or not an opinion is approved for publication in this official Court Reporter books, the Judiciary posts all Appellate Division opinions on the Internet. An opinion should be approved for publication in Court Reporter

12a

Appendix B

(17) I certify that confidential personal identifiers have been redacted from documents now submitted to the court, and will be redacted from all documents submitted in the future in accordance with Rule 1:38-7(b).

(18) Lena Lasher, Pro Se Litigant
Name of Appellant or Respondent

(19) Lena Lasher, Pro Se Litigant
Name of Counsel of Record
(or your name if *not represented by counsel*)

(20) 3/25/20
Date

(21) /s/ Lena Lasher
Signature of Counsel of Record
(or your signature if not represented by counsel)

13a

Appendix B

FORM C

Name Lena Lasher
NJ Attorney ID Number (if applicable) _____
Address 16 Patton St.
 High Bridge NJ 08829
Telephone Number 908-447-4484

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Docket Number MID L007984-18

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff(s)

v.

PETER RICCIO, et al

Defendant(s)

Filed February 10, 2020

CIVIL ACTION ORDER

This matter having been brought before the Court on
Motion of (check one) plaintiff defendant for an Order
(describe relief requested)

Appendix B

Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order of September 13, 2019 due to the fact that identity theft and a \$2.5 million FRAUD are exceptional circumstances to proceed with the Plaintiff's Complaint (Amended complaint)

and the Court having considered the matter and for good cause appearing,

It is on this 10th day of February, 2020, **ORDERED** as follows:

ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion is DENIED. The Complaint as it pertains to Laura Hishmeh remains DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo
Hon. Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

Opposed
 Unopposed

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE
PLACED ON THE RECORD IN OPEN
COURT ON February 7, 2020.

Appendix B

Edward G. Sonzilli, Esq. (Attorney ID # 013701975)
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN, P.A.
400 Crossing Boulevard, 8th Floor
P.O. Box 5933
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-5933
(908) 722-0700
Attorneys for Defendants, Peter Riccio and
Michael Della-Ventura

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW
DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO: MID-L-007984-18

CIVIL ACTION

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff,

v.

PETER RICCIO, LAURA HISMEH, MICHAEL
DELLA-VENTURA, STEVEN GOLOFF, DANIEL
GEIGER, JAMES BARNES, ALBERT BUCK, JOHN
NICHOLAS BURLING, and ANU KONAKANCHI,

Defendants.

Filed February 14, 2020

Appendix B

**ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S AFFIDAVIT
OF MERIT AND DISMISSING THE AMENDED
COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE**

THIS MATTER having been opened to the Court upon the application of the Defendants Peter Riccio and Michael Della-Ventura for an Order granting their motion to strike Plaintiff's Affidavit of Merit and to dismiss the Amended Complaint with prejudice, and the Court having considered supporting papers and arguments of counsel, if any; and for good cause shown;

IT IS on this 14th day of February 2020, 2019,
ORDERED as follows

1. Plaintiff's Affidavit of Merit filed on September 9, 2019, be and is hereby stricken;
2. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint be and is hereby dismissed with prejudice, for failure to file an Affidavit of Merit that Complies with N.J.S.A. 2A:53A-27; and
3. The within Motion is DENIED AS MOOT pursuant to Order of the Court dated February 10, 2020 pursuant to Cross-Motion to Dismiss.
3. A copy of this Order shall be served upon all counsel of record within 7 days of the date hereof.

OPPOSED

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

HON. CARLA M. BRADY, J.S.C.
Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

Appendix B

EXHIBIT A

ORDER OF CARLIA BRADY, J.S.C.
SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
CIVIL DIVISION; VICINAGE 8 – MIDDLESEX
56 PATERSON STREET, P.O. BOX 964
NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY 08903-0964

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
CIVIL DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY
DOCKET NO. MID L-7984-18

CIVIL ACTION

ORDER OF DISMISSAL
(UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT ORDER)

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff

vs.

PETER RICCIO; LAURA HISHMEH; MICHAEL
DELLA-VENTURA; STEVEN GOLOFF; DANIEL
GEIGER; JAMES BARNES; ALBERT BUCK; JOHN
NICHOLAS BURLING, MD; and
ANU “ELIZABETH” KONAKANCHI

Defendants

THE COURT, having been notified that PLAINTIFF,
LENA LASHER on June 3, 2019 was ORDERED to

Appendix B

cease pursuing the Civil Action to the extent that such action names as DEFENDANTS, STEVEN GOLOFF; DANIEL GEIGER; JAMES BARNES; ALBERT BUCK; JOHN NICHOLAS BURLING, MD and AMU "ELIZABETH" KONAKANCHI, in *UNITED STATES v. LENA LASHER*, 12 Cr. 868 (NRB) in the United States District Court:

IT IS on this 26th day of June 2019:

ORDERED that this matter is hereby dismissed without prejudice, as to DEFENDANTS, STEVEN GOLOFF; DANIEL GEIGER; JAMES BARNES; ALBERT BUCK; JOHN NICHOLAS BURLING, MD and AMU "ELIZABETH" KONAKANCHI, and it is further

ORDERED that a copy of this Order shall be served upon all parties who have not been electronically served through an approved Electronic Court System pursuant to Rule 1:32-2A, nor served personally in court.

/s/ Carla Brady
CARLIA BRADY, J.S.C.

Appendix B

EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

12 Cr. 868 (NRB)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

- against -

LENA LASHER
a/k/a Lena Congtang,

Defendant.

ORDER

NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

WHEREAS on November 28, 2018, Lena Lasher filed a civil action (the “Civil Action”), captioned *Lena Lasher v. Peter Riccio, et al.*, Civil Action MID L 007984-18, in the Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Middlesex County, naming as defendants, *inter alia*, six (6) witnesses¹ who testified at Lasher’s criminal trial in May of 2015, which resulted in her conviction, subsequently affirmed on appeal, *see United States v. Lasher*, 661 F. App’x 25

1. The six witness defendants are Steven Goloff, Daniel Geiger, James Barnes, Albert Buck, John Nicholas Burling, and Anu Konakanchi (collectively, the “Witnesses”). The Civil Action also names Lasher’s co-defendant Peter Riccio and two other individuals as defendants.

Appendix B

(2d Cir. 2016), *cert. denied*, 137 S. Ct. 2254, *r'hrg denied*, 138 S. Ct. 39 (2017); and

WHEREAS on April 9, 2019, the Government filed a motion in the instant action for an order to show cause as to why Lasher should not be ordered to (i) cease pursuing the Civil Action against the Witnesses, and (ii) refrain from pursuing any additional civil actions against the Witnesses, based on information provided by them to federal law enforcement concerning Lasher and/or their testimony in *United States v. Lena Lasher*, S5 12 Cr. 48 (NRB), without prior written leave of the Court, for a period of three years, subject to renewal for good cause shown, ECF No. 423; and

WHEREAS on April 9, 2019, the Government sent a copy of its motion to Lasher via First Class Mail, *see id.* at 13; and

WHEREAS on April 23, 2019, the Court scheduling order to show cause scheduling an in-person hearing for May 29, 2019 and establishing a series of deadlines by which (i) Lasher was advise the Court of whether she wished to proceed with an in-person hearing, and (ii) the parties were to submit papers supporting their respective positions on the requested order, *see ECF No. 429*; and

WHEREAS on April 23, 2019, the Court mailed a copy of the signed order to show cause to Lasher; and

WHEREAS Lasher failed to notify the Court as to whether she wished to proceed with an in-person hearing

Appendix B

and never submitted papers in opposition to the order requested by the Government; and

WHEREAS the Court held the scheduled hearing on May 29, 2019 at which the Government appeared but Lasher failed to appear; and

WHEREAS 18 U.S.C. § 1514(b)(1) provides that a “United States district court, upon motion of the attorney for the Government, or its own motion, shall issue a protective order prohibiting harassment of a victim or witness in a Federal criminal case or investigation if the court, after a hearing, finds by a preponderance of the evidence that harassment of an identified victim or witness in a Federal criminal case or investigation exists or that such order is necessary to prevent and restrain an offense under section 1512 of this title, other than an offense consisting of misleading conduct, or under section 1513 of this title”; and

WHEREAS the cases *United States v. Lewis*, 411 F.3d 838 (7th Cir. 2005) and *United States v. Tison*, 780 F.2d 1569 (11th Cir. 1986) support this Court’s conclusion that post-conviction civil lawsuits can constitute harassment of a witness under 18 U.S.C. § 1514; and

WHEREAS the Civil Action against the Witnesses has no legitimate purpose,” as any issue with respect to the sufficiency of the evidence supporting Lasher’s conviction must be (and was) resolved in the context of her criminal case, and further as the Civil Action against the Witnesses is time-barred insofar as it can be construed to advance

Appendix B

claims of defamation, *see* NJ Rev Stat § 2A:14-3 (2013); it is hereby

ORDERED that Lasher cease pursing the Civil Action to the extent that such action names as defendants Goloff, Geiger, Barnes, Buck, Burling, and Konakanchi; and it is further

ORDERED that Lasher not pursue any additional civil actions against the foregoing individuals, based on information provided by them to federal law enforcement concerning Lasher and/or their testimony in *United States v. Lena Lasher*, S5 12 Cr. 868 (NRB), without prior written leave of the Court, for a period of three years, subject to renewal for good cause shown.²

Dated: New York, New York
June 3, 2019

/s/ Naomi Reice Buchwald
NAOMI REICE BUCHWALD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

A copy of the foregoing Order has been sent via FedEx on this date to the following:

Lena Lasher
16 Patton Street
High Bridge, NJ 08829

2. Lasher is advised that a party that violates a court order may be held in contempt of court. and that punishment for such contempt may include fines and/or incarceration. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 402.

23a

Appendix B

FORM C

Name Lena Lasher
NJ Attorney ID Number (if applicable) _____
Address 16 Patton St.
 High Bridge NJ 08829
Telephone Number 908-447-4484

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Docket Number MID L007984-18

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff(s)

v.

PETER RICCIO, et al

Defendant(s)

Filed February 10, 2020

CIVIL ACTION ORDER

This matter having been brought before the Court on
Motion of (check one) plaintiff defendant for an **Order**
(describe relief requested)

Appendix B

Motion to reinstate complaint (amended complaint)

and the Court having considered the matter and for good cause appearing,

It is on this 10th day of February, 2020, **ORDERED** as follows:

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reinstate the Amended Complaint is DENIED. Plaintiff is barred pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:4B-61, and N.J.S.A. 2A:14-2 and thus DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo
Hon. Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

Opposed
 Unopposed

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE
PLACED ON THE RECORD IN OPEN
COURT ON February 7, 2020.

25a

Appendix B

FORM C

Name Lena Lasher
NJ Attorney ID Number (if applicable) _____
Address 16 Patton St.
 High Bridge NJ 08829
Telephone Number 908-447-4484

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Docket Number MID L007984-18

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff(s)

v.

PETER RICCIO, et al

Defendant(s)

Filed February 10, 2020

CIVIL ACTION ORDER

This matter having been brought before the Court on
Motion of (check one) plaintiff defendant for an **Order**
(describe relief requested)

Appendix B

Motion for reconsideration to vacate Defendants', Peter Riccio and Michael Della-Ventura, November 18, 2016 dismissal without prejudice and to reinstate this case via the Amended Complaint against Defendants Peter Riccio and Michael Della-Ventura

and the Court having considered the matter and for good cause appearing,

It is on this 10th day of February, 2020, **ORDERED** as follows:

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reinstate the Amended Complaint is DENIED. Plaintiff is barred pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:4B-61, and N.J.S.A. 2A:14-2 and thus DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo
Hon. Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

Opposed
 Unopposed

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE
PLACED ON THE RECORD IN OPEN
COURT ON February 7, 2020.

Appendix B

Edward G. Sonzilli, Esq. (Attorney ID # 013701975)
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN, P.A.
400 Crossing Boulevard, 8th Floor
P.O. Box 5933
Bridgewater, NJ 08807-5933
(908) 722-0700
Attorneys for Defendants, Peter Riccio and
Michael Della-Ventura

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW
DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO: MID-L-007984-18

CIVIL ACTION

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff,

v.

PETER RICCIO, LAURA HISMEH, MICHAEL
DELLA-VENTURA, STEVEN GOLOFF, DANIEL
GEIGER, JAMES BARNES, ALBERT BUCK, JOHN
NICHOLAS BURLING, and ANU KONAKANCHI,

Defendants.

Appendix B

**ORDER DISMISSING AMENDED
COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE**

THIS MATTER having been opened to the Court upon the application of the Defendants Peter Riccio and Michael Della-Ventura for an Order denying Plaintiff's motion to reinstate the complaint and granting cross-motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint with prejudice; and notice having been provided to all parties of record; and the Plaintiff having objected thereto; and the Court having considered supporting papers and arguments of counsel, if any; and for good cause shown;

IT IS on this 10th day of February, 2019[20], ORDERED as follows

1. Plaintiff's motion to reinstate her 2016 Complaint as to defendants Peter Riccio and Michael Della-Ventura be and hereby is denied;
2. Defendants Peter Riccio and Michael Della-Ventura's motion to dismiss the complaint with prejudice, as to them, be and hereby is granted.
3. A copy of this Order shall be served upon all counsel of record within 7 days of the date hereof.

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.
HON. ~~CARLA M. BRADY~~, J.S.C.
Lisa M. Vignuolo

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE
PLACED ON THE RECORD IN OPEN
COURT ON February 7, 2020.

29a

Appendix B

FORM C

Name Lena Lasher
NJ Attorney ID Number (if applicable) _____
Address 16 Patton St.
 High Bridge NJ 08829
Telephone Number 908-447-4484

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Docket Number MID L007984-18

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff(s)

v.

PETER RICCIO, et al

Defendant(s)

Filed February 10, 2020

CIVIL ACTION ORDER

This matter having been brought before the Court on Motion of (check one) plaintiff defendant for an **Order** (describe relief requested) to inform the Court that the Plaintiff has filed an Affidavit of Merit with the Court as

Appendix B

well as served the Affidavit of Merit and exhibits upon Defendants Michael Della-Ventura and Peter Riccio on September 6, 2019 to comply with New Jersey's Affidavit of Merit Requirement

and the Court having considered the matter and for good cause appearing,

It is on this 10th day of February, 2020, **ORDERED** as follows:

ORDERED that this motion is DENIED as moot in light of the denial of Plaintiff's motions to reinstate her Amended Complaint filed on July 29, 2019 and August 12, 2019.

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo

Hon. Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

Opposed

Unopposed

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE
PLACED ON THE RECORD IN OPEN
COURT ON February 7, 2020.

Appendix B

Howard D. Crane, Esq. 006331991
KOERNER & CRANE LLC
308 Route 206
Hillsborough, NJ 08844
(908) 874-6242
Attorneys for Defendant, Laura Hishmeh

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
MIDDLESEX COUNTY

DOCKET NO. MID-L-7984-18

LENA LASHER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PETER RICCIO, LAURA HISMEH, MICHAEL
DELLA-VENTURA, STEVEN GOLOFF, DANIEL
GEIGER, JAMES BARNES, ALBERT BUCK, JOHN
NICHOLAS BURLING, and ANU KONAKANCHI,

Defendants.

Filed February 10, 2020

CIVIL ACTION ORDER

THIS MATTER having been brought before the court
on Motion of Defendant, Laura Hishmeh, for an Order

Appendix B

to dismiss, and the Court having considered the matter, and any opposition submitted thereto, and for good cause shown;

IT IS on this 10th day of February, 2019[20];

ORDERED that Plaintiff, Lena Lasher's Amended Complaint is hereby stricken as it pertains to Defendant Laura Hishmeh; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of the within Order be served on all counsel within seven (7) days of the date hereof.

ORDERED that this motion is moot in light of the denial of Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Court's Order of September 13, 2019, filed September 25, 2019.

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo
HON. Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

OPPOSED X
UNOPPOSED

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE
PLACED ON THE RECORD IN OPEN
COURT ON February 7, 2020.

Appendix B

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY LAW
DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Docket No: MID-L-007984-18

CIVIL ACTION

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff,

v.

PETER RICCIO, LAURA HISMEH, MICHAEL
DELLA-VENTURA, STEVEN GOLOFF, DANIEL
GEIGER, JAMES BARNES, ALBERT BUCK, JOHN
NICHOLAS BURLING, and ANU KONAKANCHI,

Defendants.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 10th day of February, 2019[20],
upon consideration of Defendant Anu Konakanchi's Motion
to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint pursuant to
R. 4:6-2(b), (c), (d), and (e), and all submissions in support
thereof and responses and submissions in opposition
thereto, it is hereby **ORDERED** that said motion is
GRANTED. Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Anu

Appendix B

Konakanchi in the above-captioned action are hereby
DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo
~~Hon. Carla M. Brady~~
Hon. Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE PLACED
ON THE RECORD IN OPEN COURT ON
February 7, 2020.

35a

Appendix B

FORM C

Name Lena Lasher
NJ Attorney ID Number (if applicable) _____
Address 16 Patton St.
High Bridge NJ 08829
Telephone Number 908-447-4484

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION
MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Docket Number MID L007984-18

LENA LASHER

Plaintiff(s)

v.

PETER RICCIO, et al

Defendant(s)

Filed February 10, 2020

CIVIL ACTION ORDER

This matter having been brought before the Court on
Motion of (check one) plaintiff defendant for an **Order**
(describe relief requested)

Appendix B

Motion to reinstate complaint (amended complaint)
and the Court having considered the matter and for good
cause appearing,

It is on this 10th day of February, 2020, **ORDERED**
as follows:

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reinstate the
Amended Complaint is DENIED. Plaintiff is barred
pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:4B-61, and N.J.S.A. 2A:14-2 and
thus DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

/s/ Lisa M. Vignuolo
Hon. Lisa M. Vignuolo, J.S.C.

Opposed
 Unopposed

THE COURT FINDINGS OF FACT
AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW WERE
PLACED ON THE RECORD IN OPEN
COURT ON February 7, 2020.

**APPENDIX C — ORDER OF THE SUPREME
COURT OF NEW JERSEY, FILED JULY 19, 2023**

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
C-805 September Term 2022
087152

LENA LASHER,

Plaintiff-Petitioner,

v.

PETER RICCIO, LAURA HISHMEH, AND
MICHAEL DELLA-VENTURA,

Defendants-Respondents,

AND

STEVEN GOLOFF, DANIEL GEIGER, JAMES
BARNES, ALBERT BUCK, JOHN NICHOLAS
BURLING, AND ANU KONAKANCHI,

Defendants.

ORDER

Filed July 13, 2023

A petition for certification of the judgment in
A-003040-19 having been submitted to the Court, and the
Court having considered the same;

Appendix C

It is ORDERED that the petition for certification is denied.

WITNESS, the Honorable Stuart Rabner, Chief Justice, at Trenton, this 13th day of July, 2023.

/s/
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT

**APPENDIX D — ORDER OF THE SUPREME
COURT OF NEW JERSEY, FILED MARCH 5, 2024**

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY
M-585/586 September Term 2023
087152

LENA LASHER,

Plaintiff-Movant,

v.

PETER RICCIO, LAURA HISHMEH, AND
MICHAEL DELLA-VENTURA,

Defendants,

and

STEVEN GOLOFF, DANIEL GEIGER, JAMES
BARNES, ALBERT BUCK, JOHN NICHOLAS
BURLING, AND ANU KONAKANCHI,

Defendants.

ORDER

Filed March 5, 2024

It is ORDERED that the motion for leave to file an overlength brief in support of the motion for reconsideration (M-585) is granted; and it is further

40a

Appendix D

ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration of the Court's order denying the petition for certification (M-586) is denied.

WITNESS, the Honorable Stuart Rabner, Chief Justice, at Trenton, this 5th day of March, 2024.

/s/
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT

**APPENDIX E — LETTER FROM THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
FILED JUNE 7, 2024**

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

June 7, 2024

Lena Lasher
16 Patton Street
High Bridge, NJ 08829

RE: Lasher v. Riccio, et al.

Dear Ms. Lasher:

The above-entitled petition for a writ of certiorari was postmarked June 3, 2024 and received June 6, 2024. The papers are returned for the following reason(s):

On May 24, 2021, the Court directed the Clerk not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1.

In addition, your case must first be reviewed by the highest state court in which a decision could be had. 28 USC 1254 and 1257.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By: /s/
Lisa Nesbitt